

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: **Kyle G. Brown,  
Stephen G. Graham,  
Steven M. Miller  
and Mark D. Weitzel**

Group Art Unit: **2145**

Examiner: **J.R. Swearingen**

Confirmation No. **2639**

Appln. No. **10/014,106**

Attorney Docket No.

Filed: **December 11, 2001**

**RSW920010188US1**

Title: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
DYNAMIC RECONFIGURATION OF  
WEB SERVICES INFRASTRUCTURE**

---

**FILED ELECTRONICALLY ON AUGUST 7, 2006**

---

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AGENDA FOR TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW**

Sir:

In accordance with a telephone discussion between the Examiner and applicant's undersigned representative on August 3, 2006 in which applicant requested a telephone interview with the Examiner in this case, below is a proposed agenda for that interview.

**AGENDA**

Applicant requests the telephone interview in view of the Advisory Action dated July 13, 2006. Applicant wishes to discuss the issues raised in the last two paragraphs of the Advisory Action as outlined below.

I. With respect to the non-enablement rejection of claims 1-25 asserting that a Web Service is application logic, which is a method and it is not clear how a method can be embodied in a computer readable medium:

- A. Applicant does not understand the rejection and would like clarification.
  - 1. Is not all software a method embodied on a computer readable medium?
  - 2. Can the Examiner propose language that would be acceptable?

II. With respect to the Examiner's assertion that he must read the language "Web Services" as broadly as reasonable for examination purposes as encompassing "any software on a network":

- A. Is the Examiner maintaining this rejection even in view of the new language of claim 1 that provides a definition of Web Services as "software modules that can be exchanged between nodes of a network and run at said nodes"?
  - 1. Is the Examiner perhaps just interested in locating support in the specification for the new claim language?
  - 2. If the Examiner still finds this language objectionable, can he propose language that would preclude a reading of "Web Services" on "any software in a network"?

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 7, 2006

/Theodore Naccarella/  
Theodore Naccarella, Reg. No. 33,023  
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP  
2600 Aramark Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189  
Attorneys for Applicant